

Date: Mon, 11 Apr 94 04:30:24 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #168
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Mon, 11 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 168

Today's Topics:

 Incentive Licensing

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 9 Apr 94 23:41:46 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!unixg.ubc.ca!
nntp.cs.ubc.ca!cyber2.cyberstore.ca!nwnexus!ole!rwing!eskimo!wrt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Incentive Licensing
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

<p0zMh7A.edellers@delphi.com> <2ncfi7\$331@tekadm1.cse.tek.com>
<Bg3N6+w.tdement@delphi.com>
Organization: Eskimo North (206) For-Ever

In article <Bg3N6+w.tdement@delphi.com>,
Tom Dement <tdement@delphi.com> wrote:
>BRAVO AND WELL SAID!
> I am a new ham, no code tech, and also new to the internet, but
quickly getting
>[A sides) and vitriolic
>spewings concerning (mainly) the no code license. Please excuse my
typing,
>I'm not quite used to not having the a ability to backspace and
correct.
> Fellow hams seem to be so at odds, it disstres me so. The older hams
>seem to be of the opinion that "we had to do it so by god you have

to!"(code)
>and the newer no-codes say "code is outdated, we passed the test we should have
>all kinds io of band use".
> Seems to me we need to come to a compromise. What say, old timers, if newer
>hams have to learn Morse Code to gain access to more band privileges
(damn my
>typing) then you have to learn packet and computer communications SO
YOU ARE
>UP TO
>DATE WITH TECHNOLOGY! After all we don't use spark-gap radios anymore
for a
>reason, and as a user of valuable band space you should be able to put
it to
>it's most efficient use (high speed data transmission). Now...
> As for you know it all no codes, how about we change the tests
altogether. No
>more multiple
choice-all-I-have-to-do-is-memorise-this-thin-Gordon-West-manual-I-
>bought-at-Radio-Shack-with-all-the-answers-right-there!!
> After having been interested in electronics since grade school, I
found the
>tech test so ridiculously easy I passed it at a ham fest on a spur of
the
>moment
>challenge from a friend to take the test "just for the hell of it"! NO
STUDYING!
> And from listening to the HF bands and the VHF bands, no one group has
>bragging rights to proper and courteous operating standards. Some of
the things
>I have heard on HF remind me of the old CB days, (and these are not
young
>operators!)
>foul language, nets that think they "own" certain frequencies, etc...at
time I
>just have to go back to two meters and hear friendly operators to
restore my
>faith.
> Oh well, thanks for the ear, sorry about the overall appearance of
this
>letter, maybe if I change terminal emulation. Or figure out how to do
this on
>a good word processor and then upload it. Later T.D.

Tom, I hear you and I agree, sort of. I'm one of those old timers but
I've never been enamored of code. Yes, I have an extra class license,

but CW is not my favorite mode. I use it to chase some DX now and then but my real love is RADIO. The mode is beside the point.

To understand what's going on you really need to know where the old timers are coming from. It's not CW, it's not phone, it's not packet. What it is is the special status of being a licensed radio operator. Those of us who have been in the hobby many years have a love for it that goes back before the days of quick and easy licenses, and we don't much like what's happened beginning with the CB mess and just getting worse since. Turn your nose up if you will, but there are those of us who think that having a license to transmit should be evidence of a strong desire to learn about radio and all that goes with it. Personally, if they want to eliminate the CW requirement that would be fine with me. But I would like to see the FCC require some showing of real dedication to the art and science of RADIO and not just the desire to yak on the air. For chit-chat, the telephone works fine, maybe better. Or the Internet, for heaven's sake. An Amateur Radio license should be issued only to people who are interested in radio itself.

Flame deflectors are on...

73 es gl

Bill, W7LZP (37 years a ham and goin' strong!)

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #168
